

*State Interoperable &
Emergency Communication (SIEC)
Board Meeting
February 1, 2023*

Page 2 of 21

Sergeant Houck: Yes, this is Sergeant Houck available as Designee

Kathy: Thank you. Chief Ryan Greenberg?, -Designee for Dept of Health Acting Commissioner Dr. James V. McDonald

Ryan Greenberg: Here.

Kathy: Richard Anderson. Brian LaFlure?

Brian LaFlure: Yes.

Kathy: Kim Beede. Brendan Casey. Michael Volk.

Kathy: Allen Turner.

Allen Turner: Here.

Michael Volk: Here remote from Valhalla, New York.

Kathy: Thank you. Anthony Tripp.

Anthony Tripp: Present via zoom from Glen Cove, New York.

Kathy: Sheriff Figueroa.

Juan Figueroa: Here.

Kathy: Michael Cerretto.

Michael Cerretto: Here.

Kathy: Did I miss anybody?

Bob Terry: We got interrupted. Bob Terry, -Designee for New York State Department of Transportation Commissioner Marie Therese Dominguez, ~~Esq.~~Esq.

Kathy: DOT. Bob Terry, okay. Thank you.

Todd Murray: Todd Murray from DCJS., Designee for Division of Criminal Justice Services Commissioner Rossana Rosado,

Kathy: Thank you.

Mark Balistreri: For the record, we do have a **quorum present** in person here. So, I just figured the best way to approach the new year was to go over some of the meeting rules, a little bit about the Board, there are a lot of new faces, we have some visitors today, so. I think it's important that we kind of go over some of the things that really aren't in effect mostly and we'll talk about the bylaws, which we'll talk more about later on. So, some meeting rules; guests or persons who have relevant knowledge or information may attend and speak as part of the agenda upon acceptance of the meeting agenda by the Board. All other guests must be recognized by the Chair before addressing the Board or participating in the discussion. If a Board member representing a state agency is unable to attend, they may send a designee. We prefer Board members to attend these SIEC boards in person. We understand that extenuating circumstances occur and that is the reason for the WebEx. However, it cannot become law and really be here in person face to face. Over the previous couple of years due to COVID, Board members were able to attend and vote on matters remotely, however, those temporary rule changes have expired, and now only in person attendance at a predesignated location open to the public counts towards the quorum and allows members to vote on the matters. The SIEC bylaws do state Board members may participate in a meeting no more than half of the meetings held in one year by video conference. Participation by video conference shall constitute presence at such meetings for all purposes including quorum. If participating by video conference, a participant must make notice of their location pursuant to the Open Meetings Law. If participating by audio conference only, the Board member will not count as present for quorum nor will be permitted to vote.

Jim Callahan: And there are some conflicts with the Open Meeting Law, some additional context to, state by video conference can't just do an update we need to do publish notice of location and allow public access in a timeframe _____ (video fuzzy) prior to the meeting. So, we need to be aware of that. It needs to be open to the public so it's not just some many things to do the day of. So, that's something to keep in mind for that section of the bylaws.

I want to go over the **SIEC Board overview** a little bit. What the SIEC Board is all about. Most of you are aware New York County law article 26 section 715, originating from the 2010 New York legislative session created the Statewide Interoperable and Emergency Communication Board. New York law Article 6A section 328 charges the Board with its duties. When you take a look at it, keep in mind over the past few years a majority of the Board duties focused on what's listed at the bottom of the statute. As I don't want to spend a lot of time reviewing these, due to time constraints, we did include a copy in your packets, look at it, any questions, reach out to us. As far as membership, it's a ~~twenty-five~~twenty-five member Board comprised of state agency heads, state legislative representatives, representatives of First Responder organizations, and experts in the field of interoperable and emergency communications. Members are appointed for a term of four years. Current stats, there's 7 state agency spots that are all filled. There are 7 executive appointments, 4 currently, and 3 open. There are 5 senate appointments, 3 current and 2 opens, and there are 5 assembly appointments, 2 current and 3 open. The appointment process is in the bylaws. So, again, please go ahead and review that on how that

process works. That's all I have for that, just a quick overview, and like I said, we provided the documents for everybody to take a look at. If you don't have them or want copies just let us know and we can e-mail them to you.

Procedurally – I just want to quickly review Robert's Rules. Because Robert's Rules is done in a lot of different ways. What we felt would be the best way to move forward with things is keep it structured, and if we follow this format there shouldn't be any issues. So, basically, if somebody makes a motion, please include your name for the recording, because there will be a transcript from the recording and if we just hear a voice and we don't recognize who it is, it's hard to put it in the transcript. So, please if you make a motion include your name. If you second it, also include your name. And then we would have discussion on the motion among the Board. And then once the discussion is completed, we would have a vote which would either be aye, nay or abstentions. It will either be carried or defeated. Simple process, I think that's the best way for us to make sure we run our meetings. Anybody have any questions on that? Okay.

So, we're going to move right into committee reports. **911 Standards Advisory Committee**
Allen Turner.

Allen Turner: The standards have been reviewed. There was no problems found. We are going to take it back to the committee for a comparison with some other national standards, Calea, Sheriff's Association, what other one am I forgetting, NFPA [1225] just to compare and make sure that there isn't anything that might conflict farther down the line. But we're getting very close.

Mark Balistreri: Thank Al. Brett, you want to take care of the **NG 9-1-1 Working Group**?

Brett Chellis: The working group hasn't met since the last meeting. The **GIS Subcommittee**, ~~however~~however, has been meeting regularly and is very active. They've been working on continuing to collect PSAP boundary shape files from the counties that has really helped the project with NG 911 moving forward. The state is going to have to have an accurate completely vetted layer of PSAP boundaries in order for ~~location-based~~location-based routing work properly. We will hear more about the location-based routing in a few minutes. But it's a lot of work and sounds easy. You just throw in a computer, and you've got it, right? No, they all have to be edge mapped. There can't be any gaps, no overlays, real property mapping you know property boundary mapping and stuff. It gets very, very technical and complicated. So, we're working on ways to expedite that but in total, they've been doing a heck of a job. The committee is co-chaired just for review by ITS GIS program office representative, Gerry Engstrom. I didn't see Gerry here[today,], no, -And a representative from New York City DoITT-, now called the Mayor's office of something Technology and Innovation. So, they co-chaired the committee and it's very good because as you know, New York City is in the middle of an NG911 implementation project and so there is a lot of things they're learning through the process in their work with Geocom a vendor on this process as they work with neighboring counties and so on. So, that's brought a lot of good information to the group. So, we look forward to their work and

itsit's probably the most important thing we can be doing now while we work on the proposals and everything else.

Mark Balistreri: Any questions? Okay. Is Jay on the call.

Matthew Delaney: Jay is having trouble getting in. I just resent him the link.

Mark Balistreri: We'll swing back around to Jay. One thing I neglected to do is I'll entertain a motion to accept the previous minutes and the agenda for today's meeting.

Brian LaFlure: I make that motion, Brian LaFlure.

Juan Figueroa: I'll second, Figueroa.

Mark Balistreri: Second by the Sheriff. All in favor?

All: Aye.

Mark Balistreri: Opposed? I assume that's in favor. Alright the motion is passed. We'll move onto committees, and we'll come back to Jay if he gets connected. Mr. Delaney.

Matt Delaney: Good morning, everyone. **Channel Naming and Use Working Group**. So, this is a reminder we have a number of guidelines on our website, some of them haven't been changed in a few years, so if you see anything that's necessary and needs to be changed or a guideline that we don't have that we should have as a guideline, just feel free to let us know.

Mark Balistreri: We'll move right into the **Public Safety Broadband User Group**, and still Matt.

Matt Delaney: I've got a couple slides here. First is major carrier support to the World University Games that just wrapped up. For those who aren't familiar, the collegiate sports Federation held the World University Games for collegiate athletes in January at Lake Placid and actually spread across a number of north country counties. A lot of work was done with the carriers to improve coverage. Obviously, some of the areas up there were having difficulty in terms of coverage capacity, work was done. It's the best you can do in some of those areas, there are areas up there you can't necessarily build because of the forever wild or terrain, a lot of stuff was put in and temporary assets were put in as well. Western New York snowstorm last month, there were some cell site outages during the storm. Actually, one site fell over in the high winds. Nobody was hurt as it was in a back parking lot but sites were impacted. Generally speaking, there was overlapping coverage and SOS mode on phones. Some people were seeing SOS mode but that still allows them to dial 911 carriers, so there wasn't any significant impacts to coverage that we're aware of.

In-Building Systems –when working with building owners, zoning officials, etc. on in-building coverage from LMR, there are building code requirements for that. You should also consider cellular coverage enhancement at the same time. It's not a building code requirement on cellular coverage but certainly I think more and more people are expecting in-building coverage from your cell phones to work universally, but it's actually a public safety impact. If folks are using cellular for example on tablets or phones for using EMS for example, but also 911, I mean most 911 calls today are coming from cell phones. If you have the ability to dial 911 from in-building, that is beneficial.

Mark Balistreri: Before I move on, Lieutenant Morris, I know the State Police had a large presence at the games for the whole month of January. Do you want to speak to anything?

Lieutenant Morris: Sure, overall, the games went well, communications went very well. Our partners at OIEC, Buddy and his team, and other state agencies allowed us use of their frequencies that were already set up and predeployed. But we worked together with all of them try to get a good frequency plan, a lot of cross patching, and we used every spectrum that was available to make it work and it went well. To Matt's point, I worked closely with the carriers to get additional coverage on the main route in. They also provided additional coverage and opened up their bandwidth at all events where we had tower sites. So, it went very well, was pretty smooth on communications, and it was from the start of January 6th and ended the 20th, was that the last, I think the 23rd was the close of the PSOC but the games ended on the 20th. We probably started in like end of August, early September, we started the planning stages of that and then it was getting the assets, getting deployed. We did about a week of testing prior to the games to make sure communications were up and solid and we were. It held for the entire games. We had really no problems at all.

Mark Balistreri: Very well organized. Great job by all. It was an example of what to do and how to do it right. Get everybody included from the beginning and plan it out and it went off I would say almost flawlessly. I'm sure there were minor glitches as we all...

Lieutenant Morris: Communication system that's all I cared about. There were other flaws elsewhere. There were certain tests people couldn't pass.

Mark Balistreri: Thank you, Lieutenant. Alright we'll move on to **Citizen Alerting Committee** and Matt Delaney, you're on.

Matt Delaney: Thank you. ~~So~~So, a couple slides here; the FCC released a proposed rulemaking that would require EAS participants, broadcasters, cable TV and the like to reinforce for cybersecurity. They would have to report unauthorized acts to EAS within 72 hours and create a cybersecurity risk plan. The issue here is that alerting and EAS specifically so the FCC's role is mostly on the emergency alert system which we usually hear on radio or television. Very much, those are becoming IT connected, Internet connected systems these days. There are still backups related to relays over the air that have been in existence since EAS and before that EBS. But

with more and more things becoming internet connected and sitting on both internal networks or external networks, there is also a cybersecurity risk. There have been some close calls in cybersecurity EAS over the years and across the nation, so the FCC has really been trying to get ahead of that and create a notification process and make everybody who participates in EAS really start thinking about cybersecurity and to report those incidents when they occur.

Another thing is that wireless providers would have to include authentication information in their alerts. These you hear, the way cell phones work, it is possible to it would not be easy and certainly would be very difficult and very limited attack, but it is possible to potentially spoof. There havehas been sort of laboratory type educational studies done on the ability to spoof alerts and spoof wireless networks. So, there is in theory a possibility that an attacker could create a fake alert to go out on cell phones that allows alerts to go off on your cell phone. The FCC is going to try to get ahead. I'm not aware of any actual attacks that have happened in this country of that particular nature. But I think the FCC is trying to get ahead of it and provide authentication so that the phone would ensure that the message is actually coming from the cell carrier, not from somebody hacking and creating a false alert.

And then **EAS Plan Updates**. The New York State Broadcasters Association and the State Emergency Communications Committee submitted last July an updated EAS plan for emergency alerting. The FCC had some clarification questions. They are primarily around making sure there's enough levels of redundancy in the alerting that every station can hear two other stations and what the assignments are. Radio stations are assigned to other stations to listen to for emergency alert. An alert is generated and then goes out over the air and the next station hears it and can relay, and they have to be able to hear two other stations, monitoring two other stations. A lot of it is now coming through on the Internet directly, but we still have to monitor those stations. If the Internet connection was down, they could still get the message the other way. The Internet delivery of it actually gives you the ability to put in multiple languages. It allows you to put in additional longer messages. If you're looking at something like a television broadcast, it allows you to put in a picture or other details that are not capable in the legacy over the area format. But the legacy over the air EAS is still a fallback to get that short message out so they get the emergency message. This is just mostly a work in progress by the Broadcasters Association, but the State does sit on the SECC. Any questions?

Mark Balistreri: Alright, thanks Matt. Jay are you there?

Jay Kopstein: I'm here, I had trouble getting in but I'm here.

Mark Balistreri: Alright, we're going to circle back around for your **SAFCOM report** Jay.

Jay Kopstein: Okay, first of all, Chris Tuttle is recuperating in the hospital. He sends his regards, unfortunately, he had major surgery, and he can't dial in. So, having said that, I'm sorry but my report is going to be a little bit lengthy. I'll try to go through it as quickly as possible.

First, as Mark is aware, I presented down at the IAEM in November on third party dependencies. There is going to be a new national study and a new online collection format that's being beta tested as we speak. There is a new document under review called Cyber Disruption in an Evolving 911 Environment that should be out shortly. From SAFECOM technology, what we're looking at for this calendar year is denial of services on GPS, alerts and warnings, and artificial intelligence. There is a NIFOGS out. Phil has the information on how to order it, so we're going to work on that. If Phil has a ~~problem~~problem, he can reach back to me or to Chris Tuttle.

The National Cyber Working Group is looking to do some national information coordination to get cyber information out more quickly. The Department of Defense is looking at ~~state based~~state-based communications. SAFECOM and perhaps NCSWIC there is a new demographic form coming out for the membership. The NECP update should be out in the fourth quarter of '24. The FCC is looking to modify their current presentation on 911 resiliency. For Mark, the spring SAFECOM meeting is in May in Pasadena and the Executive Board meeting for SAFECOM and NCSWIC are at the end of this month in Pittsburgh. If you have any information or any items you want for me to bring up, please let me know. There is going to be a FEMA NIMS update shortly. Its going to include the communications branch under the logistics section with 3 units and associated positions. The P25, if you're doing radio, we're going to recommend multi key, if you're doing P25 encryption. The Information Sharing Taskforce is looking at the interoperability between CAD standards that Iowa is implementing. There is a new document that's come out called *Preparing for Technological Transformation in ECCS*. The P25 Working group is looking at P25 in a ~~cloud based~~cloud-based environment. Another document under CISA review is a link for Public Safety LMR for IT professionals. Since more LMR systems are falling under IT, we're trying to teach IT for example, they can't take it down to 2 or 3 hours on a Sunday night, public safety can't live with that. The last two items, right now we're going to be re-reviewing communications during hurricane Ian down in Florida. We're going to be looking at cellular and alerts and warnings. We're trying to collect the AAR's to get information and finally, there is another document coming out that Mike Davis is much involved with, making a business case decision for interoperability and also refreshing a lifecycle document. Does anybody have any questions? I'm sorry I had to go so quickly through the thing, I know time is pressing. Mark back to you.

Mark Balistreri: Thanks Jay. Just on the NIFOG, Phil ordered I think 250 of them. The last time we had an update we ordered them and because of the large amount of orders they get, we never even got the last one. What we're encouraging people to do is, download the application on your phone, on your tablet. It's a great application, it's the latest update. And I believe when you go back to the application it updates to the most current one. You can search through it. It's a lot easier to use. We did order it and as we get it we'll talk to everybody about distributing. But in the interim, the application works great. We are also working on, this year we're going to turn our NYSTICFOG which is the companion document to the NIFOG but it's New York State information. We're working on turning that into an application as well. We are going to assist the ECD through the TA process to do that. So, just a couple of bits on that. Any other questions for Jay or any questions on that? Okay. **State Agency Working Group**. We met

back on January 23rd. Prior to that Matt and I went out and met individually with the state agency partners and we are reigniting that committee. We're working on making it more active which we're going to talk about for some of the committees here on the SIEC Board as well and it's been working out really well. We've got some conversations going on, we're also started to connect some people in the state agencies with the county partners for some of the projects they're working on. So, it's going to work out really well. And I'll have a more in-depth report probably in May on the State Agency Working Group, but for now it's moving in the right direction. Any questions on any of the committees? Okay, I'll entertain a motion to accept the committees.

Allen Turner: I make a motion, Allen Turner.

Mark Balistreri: Allen Turner.

Anthony Tripp: Second the motion, Anthony Tripp.

Mark Balistreri: Second. All in favor?

All: Aye.

Mark Balistreri: Opposed? Okay. Now we're going to have some **Program Updates**. We'll start with Matt [the **SICG Grant Program**].

Matt Delaney: I'm going to go through each of the grants just give quick updates. The **SICG Formula Grant**, the last [award] announcement was made in August, that was a combined 2 years of grants. That was a \$90 million award and as you can see, we're just starting with \$610,000 in vouchers because ~~it's~~ only been out there for a few months. Contracts are being developed and so forth. That grant currently runs through 12/31/23.

We have several other open grants still, going back in time previous years, this one through the end of this year right now, only \$10.5 million is vouchered out of a \$45 million grant. The one before that \$31 million out of \$45 million. So, if you are awarded and you have a grant, spend your money and then get your vouchers in. So, if you have spent make sure you're submitting your vouchers.

PSAP Operations Grant. We have two open right now, [the one awarded in] August and the year previous. These were \$10 million grants, \$9 million has been vouchered from 2 years ago and then this one is already at \$2.4 million out of 10. The expenses are a little different for eligible expenses for PSAP Operations compared to Formula. A lot of this is based on operational expenses, so it gets vouchered quicker. Extensions are being considered on an individual basis.

Ryan Greenburg: Matt, operational expenses such as what?

Matt Delaney: Things like salaries, communication expenses are allowable. Things related to the operation of the PSAP. And these are county grants and should be up to counties.

Brett Chellis: Operations is pretty broad word in that, it's everything from your maintenance of your consoles, your [911] phone system, that type of stuff as well.

Ryan Greenburg: Is it they applied for a particular thing they're looking for? What's the process on that?

Matt Delaney: They submit a budget. So, these are grants, this one and the one I just spoke about a moment ago are formula based. So, the award amount is subject to a formula. So, the county gets a certain amount of money based on call volume, CAD incidents, and so forth. And then they submit a budget during contract development after the award that indicates what they will be spending their money on and then they submit their vouchers and get reimbursed for it.

Ryan Greenberg: So, hypothetically, if somebody wanted to enhance their emergency medical dispatch within their PSAP, updating their software, technology, things like that, this would be a grant that they might be eligible for?

Matt Delaney: I believe so, we'd have to look, but I believe so.

Mark Balistreri: The Chair recognizes Nicole Erickson from grants.

Nicole Erickson: Yeah, just a note on this so, all of those contracts are managed with our grants program administration unit so we work closely, Ryan is our contracts rep that handles all of the reallocation requests but we work closely with the counties and executing their contracts, making sure they're spending is appropriate, validating everything with our Office of Interop and Communication and really kind of working collectively as a unit to make sure that this funding is spent. I will say that there are, because this is state funding, there are additional requirements so sometimes the spending doesn't necessarily jive because there are certain MWBE requirements that would have to be done, procurement requirement, so it is large grant dollars so there is a delay in the spending. [With] the PSAP [Grant,] you'll see a lot easier because ~~it's~~ more of those operational expenses which are easier to voucher.

Mark Balistreri: Thank you. If you have any other questions, we can certainly talk off-line and get you a copy and let you see what's allowable and non-permissible stuff is.

Ryan Greenburg: Great. Thanks.

Matt Delaney: **SICG Targeted Grants.** This is a targeted grant and so currently, we're in the budget development and pre-award stage for 2022 SICG Targeted. This is \$62 million because it's 3 years of appropriations and a little bit left from previous appropriations; obviously we

don't have a budget period or vouchers for that yet. If you look back at the original first two phases of the 2018 SICG Targeted, this one runs through November 30th of this year only \$18 million of \$32 million has been vouchered. And then in phase 2 which runs through 2025, \$7.5 million of about \$30 million. These tend to be more involved projects, construction of new tower sites, new radio systems, and so forth. Sometimes takes longer, a lot more involved, environmental reviews can be involved and zoning, building towers, construction, supply chain delays, but as we always say to our awardee, try your hardest to spend money and get those vouchers in as soon as you can. Questions on Targeted?

I will just mention that previous recurrent PSAP Operations and Formula grant awards were announced back in August. We're working on the targeted grant. So, to date over \$729 million in state grant money has been awarded since the program's inception in 2011. And please submit your vouchers.

Mark Balistreri: Okay. So, as most of you folks know my primary responsibility as a radio engineer was the **Communications Unit Program** for the State. This now falls on Phil McGeough and Julie Schwartz. But unfortunately, we had a duplicate meeting today and they're attending that meeting for [OIEC]. I remember the COMU program, I'll do it.

So, anyway, this is our COMU program schedule that they've come up with for 2023. We have a COML course actually next week. We do have quite a few openings, so if you have folks that you would like to get to the COML course, reach out directly to Phil and Julie, they will walk you through how we can get them in LMS and get them to the course. We are still holding it. It's a State sponsored course so, we're able to hold those if we don't meet the minimum number of students but there are quite a few openings. So, if you have folks you want to get through this, go off-line and try to fill that course or get more folks in that.

Last year, we did some regional training workshops. We went out to different [areas] of the state. It worked out well. And what we decided to do was to continue doing that each year and just change the location to where we're going. So, this year, you'll see these as we go along. But the first one is going to be in Oswego in February. We're going to do another one in Dutchess County and then I believe the next slide shows one in Warren County in June. And basically, we go out and bring the equipment and talk about the COMU program. We talk about what communication assets we have. We bring the vehicles. The first part of the day is basically power point presentations and then the second part of the day is hands on. We go outside, hopefully in February we'll find a warm spot, and we basically pull the equipment out, the crews come up and it's a really, really good learning tool. That way you can see what you've got if you ever need to request stuff, and you actually touch it, set it up, any questions anybody has and we will continue to do this every year and move it around the state.

So, the next course after the COML is the COMT in March. We are going to do another train-the-trainer. We found that COMT was one of the most valuable COMU positions because that's pretty much what our folks do when we go out [in the field]. We're doing technician work, -and

a lot of folks request it. The first three days of the course are basically power point and what we're required to do from CISA. We also add in some modules of our own like jamming, thank you to Brian LaFlure for putting that together, and a safety module because we feel safety is really important and one of the things in communications that is often forgotten, especially on a technician level. And then the last two days or day and a half is exercise. A little mini exercise. We set up microwave shots, we patch radios, make cables, right, make cap cables, program radios. We try and do as much as we can with the students so they get hands on with this stuff. So, because of that we decided to do other train-the-trainer course so we can increase our instructor pool. Right ~~now~~now, we have 8 instructors, we'd like to increase our instructor pool so when we take that step into regional trainings, which at some point we're going to, we will have enough instructors to do multiple courses if we want to. We do one COMMEX a year at the SPTC. Generally, CISA would come and show us how to do a COMMEX and basically, it's more of a COMMEX train-the-trainer if you will. Well, this year is going to be the first one that we're going to do that is going to be based on New York State stuff and local stuff in the area. So, we're going to try and make it as real as possible. We are going to have a [simulated] real event. We're going to set up a command post, we're going to set up an EOC, we're going to connect all the dots. It's going to be like a real event, that's what we're shooting for. And it's going to be specific to New York. So, this should be pretty good. Unfortunately, we can't invite 300 people to do it, but I think as we do it each year and get better at it, it will be really valuable for everybody.

And then we're going to do a COML train-the-trainer, again, we have 12 COML instructors in the state, so we want to increase our pool for when we jump into that regional training. Orange County, we have I believe 3 AUXCOMM instructors down in the area. They requested to do a course down there. So, they're offering an AUXCOMM course down in Orange County. Incident Communication Center Manager course in June at the SPTC. RADO course at the end of June. I think that should be a 06 I would imagine right, I don't know what month 60 is. God help us if there were 60 months. And then we're going to do another COMT course in October and AUXCOMM course ourselves at the SPTC and then we're going to have our COMU instructor meeting and exercise in December, which we do every year. We get all the instructors together and we basically look at all the evaluations from the previous courses during the year and we come up with bullets on how we can make it better, how we can improve what we're doing already with the program.

I would ask that you guys help promote this program at this point because I know a lot of you folks have asked about these courses. Reach out to our office, Julie and Phil will be more than happy to provide whatever information you need, and we've already talked to our consortium partners about possibly maybe looking at some regional stuff, maybe possibly in 2025, or 2024. So, we want to start planning for that this year, or at least look at it.

So, as far as Credentialed folks statewide, this is where we are. We've got 185, you can see there across the different ICS positions under COMU. This number is more than all the rest and I've already touched on that. It seems to be one of the most important roles.

This gives you an idea on how many folks have been trained. We had 450 when I started 5 years ago, we've added in another 600, so we're well over 1,000 trained folks out there, and we think obviously that number is going to go up each year by hopefully this number. Everybody knows what happened between 20 and 21, actually 20, 21, and into 22 was COVID so that affected our numbers, but we'd like to be at somewhere between 150 and 200 a year. Any questions about the COMU program?

Male: When is your next ITSL program, you had nothing marked for 2023.

Mark Balistreri: Yeah, we didn't do an ITSL this year. We want to build those other ranks. Other questions? Okay. Over to Brett for the **911 Program update**.

Brett Chellis: We've got a number of 911 coordinators in the room, so it's good to recognize that, [since there are] probably more than I've seen in a meeting in a long time. But the President of the State 911 Coordinator Association, Marc Kasprzak from Niagara County Sheriff's Office. A couple of Past Presidents, Kelly Donahue from Clinton County, David Cook here representing FirstNet, I think he's like the charter past President, right? Retired past president, OK. Who else do we have here, Joe Plummer, from Jefferson [County]...

Male: Kevin Pooley, Vice President, 911 Coordinators.

Brett Chellis: Oh, yes, you're Vice President, Kevin Pooley from Oswego [County]. And we've got [Dana Smith from] Dutchess and [Stephen DeChick from Ontario] County here. Very well represented. Is there anyone I missed? Oh, State Police 911 coordinator, Lieutenant Tim Morris. County of State Police. (terrible recording, people laughing). Oh, and Allen, sorry, Allen Turner, [Orleans County] 911 Coordinator, see what I started, now I'm getting myself in trouble here. Alright.

So, 911 Program update. It's nice we've done a lot of work recently. So glad the Director is on board and your transition just about done, right? You're off and running.

Male: I'm still the new guy for another year.

Brett Chellis: Off and running, so it's good we can get down to a lot of work. And this thing came on board and it's a lot more people there's chatter about it. I'm surprised there isn't more chatter in 911 about it. The FCC has issued this month a Notice of Proposed Rules on Location Based Routing for Wireless 911 calls. I talked about that with NG911 a little while ago and the GIS aspects of that with PSAP boundaries. It seems pretty big because what's happening here is the wireless..., we see here the comments are due by February 16th. And the [reply] comments by March 20th. What they're proposing at the FCC is basically to require this of the wireless providers, so this is ahead of getting into the NG911 network and an NG911 system. They propose that the wireless providers, commercial mobile radio service and covered text providers

for 911, deploy technology supporting ~~location-based~~location-based routing for IP based networks. And use location based routing to route all 911 voice calls and text originating from their networks when the caller information meets certain baseline accuracy. There has been a lot of improvement over the year few years in location accuracy of wireless 911 calls, and that's because some creative technology companies, one of them New York based, providing regional, (they are technically a vendor because they provide this technology to every PSAP in the country at no cost). What they've done is figured out along with others in the field, is, how to use your SmartPhones in your hand that seems to know where you are pretty well when you're ordering pizza, but not necessarily know where you are when you dial 911. They use that SmartPhone technology in a hybrid fashion with the existing technology of 911 systems using tower sites and a GPS chip, triangulating [tower locations]or in combination thereof. All that [is now being used] together coming up with much better accuracy as the PSAP's are seeing in that Rapid SOS [provided] location module in PSAP's [which is] is running alongside their 911 system. Recognizing that one of the wireless providers, AT&T, (I can name the provider because they're right in the FCC Notice of Rulemaking), notified the FCC that as of July of last year, they were routing 911 calls, bypassing the current tower [based routing policy] practice when they feel good about the location, and instead, they're sending it based on the PSAP boundary direct to the proper 911 center. Now, you think it would go to the right center all the time, right? But the way it works today, your routing is based on the sector of the cell tower you've hit. Now this is with Enhanced 911, [currently in use throughout New York today]. So, if we continue to read, keep in mind when AT&T announced that, they said, "yeah, they can do it on E911 as well,. As long as we get ahead of it and have a good location, instead of sending to the PSAP that the antenna on the tower is telling us to send to, we'll send it based on [the ~~callers~~caller's location as plotted on]our map to the right PSAP". The FCC took note of that. They put out a preliminary thing and then now this. They said, "okay, if AT&T can do it, why can't all of our providers do it?" That's what's happening right before our eyes.

So, to route to the proper PSAP using LBR and if the accuracy is not good enough or the timeliness not good enough, then, basically they'll use the exiting technology. They would deliver the call/text associated routing in IP format at the request of E911 authorities who have established the capability to accept NG911 compatible IP. So, they're saying they have to do it for NG911. So, why am I talking about NG911? So, let's keep going. FCC is saying, okay we are required to do it for NG but it's a tentative conclusion that LBR should be required for all routing ... both E911 and NG911. New York is an Enhanced 911 "Legacy" environment. So, the FCC is basically saying that they're going to require this on E911 unless anybody objects by February 16th. The FCC is also asking on the need for the FCC to establish a registry, -if- this is going to work. Should there be a registry or database?, It would allow state and local 911 authorities to notify the providers that they're ready for this, they can handle it. And should it be organized by PSAP, State, ESInet or how do they organize it? Do we combine with the existing MSAG registry that the FCC has? So, there's a little bit on how that's going to work that seems to be up in the air yet, but that's why I'm giving notice here of it, because this Board is responsible for keeping an eye on the 911 systems in the State and these are issues that are going to start [coming up, perhaps] as the State hits the road and gets some traction [with NG911], this

thing is going to bring up some more questions and answers initially. But we'll see how it evolves.

What is the right authority for the routing decisions and notifications? This is the kind of question that's going to give our Board here a little bit of... I don't think we'll lose any sleep but the kind of things that, because the State board in itself has some responsibility in terms of routing the 911 calls in New York State at least in terms of the designated PSAP within a county. So, with that responsibility, the Board may in fact have to be consulted on this should things start to, should this affect those things in New York? Now, what I couldn't find in this, reading this over and over, and I'm also working with the National Association of State 911 Administrators. They have a committee on this and I'm on the committee, and what's not asked in this notice is what PSAP boundary are they considering requiring them to route to? There is an assumption here that it's the existing boundary of practice. What is AT&T doing [currently]? The assumption is that it's the existing boundary layers, right, as they're in use for wireless calls. In other words, let's take a county that we've got here that has local PSAP's in. Marc, you have Lockport and Niagara Falls, right? So you've got two, so in Niagara County, -New York, all wireless 911 calls -[are routed] to the Niagara County Sheriff's Office as designated by the SIEC Board or the old 911 Board when phase 2 and all that was done back in the 90s. So, landline [calls] however, are based on the emergency service number district, basically goes to either direct to Lockport or Niagara Falls or the County. Wireless goes to the County. In Westchester County where we have 30 some PSAP's, maybe 40, the State Police handle all the wireless 911 calls and all day long redirect the ones the State Police aren't going to handle to Yonkers, White Plains, New Rochelle, and 36 or 38 other PSAP's all day long. That takes time on the phone. What's that do? That takes time away from emergency response. The fire and police units aren't going to be dispatched, nobody is going to hit the road until that call gets transferred and the information gets to the PSAP that's going to dispatch those units. So, you can see the delay. The FCC recognizes there is millions of calls a year where this is going on. There is also because of the way calls are routed, you have a river right. You have boundaries. It's conceivable that a call, somebody could be in the City of Buffalo and hit a tower in Niagara County correct? Okay, and the call gets directed to Niagara County because of which antenna it hit in our Legacy 911 system. It happens all day long in New York City. Calls going to New Jersey and have to be transferred back to New York City across the Hudson River. It happens near Nassau County line. It happens when calls in Westchester County are being answered by Nassau County. It goes across the Long Island Sound and has to be re-directed back across the Long Island Sound to Westchester. And then maybe directed to a local PSAP. So, this stuff goes on and FCC recognized there is, I think they believe over half a million calls a year, and that's a conservative number of these what they call misdirected calls, where the call is going to a PSAP that's not supposed to get it. The wrong PSAP is because they hit a tower outside of the area and gets routed to a different PSAP. So, that could take up the whole afternoon, you guys. So, what this is doing is the Location Based Routing is saying, no wait a minute, we're smart enough now, we've got these SmartPhones right, we can get ahead of this. Instead of using the antenna to route to New Jersey when it should be in Manhattan, we're going to look at the map and see that that person is actually in Manhattan and send it to New York City. And send it to

Niagara County instead of Buffalo. So, that's what this is about. It's going to save millions of minutes out of dispatch time a year nationwide when this thing happens, even in E911 if they can make that happen. So, what's going to affect us is, if they're just going to require, alright do what you're doing now, they route them all to Niagara County or within Niagara County, eliminate the misdirected, which is a great factor. Its not going to take long for somebody to say, if we can do that why not send them right to Niagara Falls? Why can't we send them right to Lockport? Why can't we send them right to Yonkers? So on and so forth, that's where the Board and saying. So, the question that NASNA has, and I would believe we would have is who makes that decision for New York? Who's going to decide? Who's going to tell AT&T, Verizon and T-Mobile where to send those calls to? I believe the FCC is going to say, eliminate the misdirection in what we're doing today and then they're trying to figure out themselves who do they depend on to notify them to make any changes. So, that's what I'm trying to say here. As far as writing this, that's a technical question as far as your call handling equipment and so on. I don't believe there's any change to that other than the location. They may have some more central data they said and more accurate dispatchable stuff, so there may have to be some stuff there. As far as being ready, that part we'll try to get a handle on as well. But I think I've covered it. Any questions on that part? I just wanted to make note of it cause I'm excited about it, but at the same time, I'm kind of like trying to figure out exactly what the heck is going on and we want to make sure advance and the FCC has the information on what the issues are going to be and what questions need to be decided ahead of time so there isn't confusion.

In other news, we've been working on preparation of the Minimum Standards update proposal research with the new NFPA 1225 release which many PSAPs depend on for an informative, PSAP standard [or best practice]. So, we continue to update research involving NG911 through participation in NASNA meetings and committees. We intend on getting the working group back together just for an update and level setting in the near future, so that everybody is on the same page. It's basically been on pause since the pandemic. A, they were very busy during the pandemic, but also, waiting basically on direction as we worked the proposal. We hope to at least do a level setting and get updated so that we're ready on that. Also, continue to monitor the stuff that's going on. A lot of the PSAP's in the state are having staffing shortages, exasperated by civil service stuff that's why some of these 911 coordinators are here today is cause they were actually down talking to the representatives yesterday.

Ski slopes. They're driving centers nuts this year. iPhone 14 came out with crash detection, which automatically dials 911 when the phone believes you've been in a crash. It's happening on ski slopes a lot, where 911 calls are going to PSAP's. So, not sure where that's going to go but other things and things like Uber and all that have 911 notification feature in it now. Vehicles more and more car manufacturers are doing this stuff Onstar, so we're just keeping an eye on that trying to keep everybody informed. And I'd like to mention an issue in New York. PSAP is getting a lot of it.

The LBR thing I was talking about, you'll notice already companies are some of the aggregators and other companies were getting calls already calling counties asking for PSAP boundaries and

so on due to the anticipated FCC requirement. 988- Mental health hotline was formerly the suicide prevention hotline. It's called 988 as of last July. They reported they've had at least 3 million calls...

Male: Yeah, it's more than that in the timeframe.

Brett Chellis: More than, like 10 million nationwide that their system has seen already. It's being used and numbers are increasing. They had a major outage; it was a day or a day and a half in December. The FCC I know has a lot of stuff on that. There is another notice of proposed rules that has to do with 988 and should that have to need be outage notification requirements of 911 where people get notified. Because there seemed to be a big delay in anybody knowing, I think our office and Mental Health found out when I emailed them after state 911 programs started checking with each other.. , Dana here from Dutchess has been very big in this process of engaging 988 with 911 for a better service for all Dutchess County, thank you Dana for all that work you're doing there. And everybody else who has worked on the subcommittee.

Regarding other activity, the NFPA 3000 Committee -Standard for Active Shooter and Hostile Environment Response. The NFPA committee was informed, after being requested of the City of Orlando after the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando in 2016. They basically said, "we need to get law enforcement, fire, and EMS together on this stuff. There are too many things that are occurring and there's too many repeated issues with these incidents that you see in the after action reviews. So, NFPA was chosen because they were the mechanism that law enforcement, fire, and EMS agreed had the best standards producing system where they could manage such a multi discipline, multijurisdictional thing. It's the first time the NFPA really took on a law enforcement centric issue. Because also involves fire, because it involves EMS and it's also one of the first times, they allowed a draft standard to hit the street as an emergency action because of the urgency of this issue. It's sad that that is the case in this country but at least they did this and now we're going onto the second draft meeting which means they had the draft standard, then they had the first draft meetings which I went to in San Diego a few years ago, adopted the standard, and now we're going into the second version of it, at their [full technical committee] meeting n March in New Orleans. We've had two preliminary meetings ~~virtual, and virtual and~~ adopt in March the second rendition of this thing, actually the third including the original draft. But I put this up here today because there seems to be around the country a lack of recognition or awareness of this standard existing. There is a whole chapter on communications, and that's why I'm on that committee. I'm representing NASNA because I unfortunately, was a 911 director for the ACA active shooter incident here in New York in 2009 in Binghamton. So, they asked me to represent the 911 community from across the country on this committee, and it's very interesting to sit with all these people from around the country. So, any input you guys have, I have now until March to provide it to the committee. Take a look at this standard. It has stuff for your communication center, it has stuff for your law enforcement, fire, EMS agencies. And I'm here to plug it personally, because I think it's important. (Not representing the NFPA, or any of it's

committees officially) -There's too many of these incidents. Any questions? I'm dried up, sorry, I should have brought my water up with me.

Mark Balistreri: Thank you Brett. Okay, we're now onto other updates and reports. Right now we only have one area, our C3 group...

Jay Kopstein: Mark, I've got a question.

Mark Balistreri: Go ahead Jay.

Jay Kopstein: Is the New York State Association and Chiefs of Police on board with this NFPA 3000?

Brett Chellis: I'd have to look if they have an actual committee member. I do not know, if there is other representation from within New York State, other than New York City with FDNY and, I believe the NYPD is on it. I can't tell you for sure on that, I will check on that and I'll let you know. But I can't tell you whether they're on board, you'd have to ask them.

Jay Kopstein: It might not be a bad idea if we're going to be involved with it on the state level to make sure that they're advised.

Brett Chellis: I believe that that committee has something that any agency can apply to be on. There's a process through the NFPA, look it up, that's what I had to do and it's an application process and the standards board at the NFPA will review it but they're looking for participation, by all means. I would imagine they'd be open to any law enforcement, fire, or EMS representation. There is ~~an~~ a broad representation in this committee, of all those but even your lock and security hardware companies have representation because there's also issues of security devices vs. fire exiting capability from structures, correct? So, those things are reasons. There's issues in these active shooter incidents about access into buildings and ways people can get out. So that's why they have representation from just about any area that you can think of, from the recovery of these incidents to the response.

Mark Balistreri: So, Jay Brett will find that information out and get with you offline on it.

Jay Kopstein: Okay, thank you.

Mark Balistreri: Any other questions? Okay, so last night the C3 group met for those that aren't familiar, this is the Consortium chairs from all 9 consortiums in the state and we did this last at the last meeting and it worked out really well. Last night, they officially recognized the chair now and a co-chair and a secretary so, the chair – Dana Smith is going to do this.

Dana Smith: For once I was at the meeting. Dana Smith representing the Hudson Valley Consortium. My day job is I'm the Commissioner of Emergency Response in Dutchess County.

It's a pleasure to be here this morning with you and thank you. As the Director mentioned, the Consortium chairs after our last meeting had a conversation, this was in the fall, about organizing our group a little bit better, working closely together as consortium chairs, and pushing stuff up to the office. Last night in our meeting, that was the conversation, and Mark and his staff absolutely supported that, and I said, yes. So, the consortium chairs represent the individual counties and from there it will come up through the C3 group and then we'll work closely with the office. And our plan is to meet regularly before our C3 meeting, which always is the night before this board meets. Some of the things that we're looking at as one in talking with the office, it's been 11 years since the grants have been out, permissible vs non-permissible costs, there's always concerns about that. So, the consortium chairs will be seeking feedback from their individual counties and then come back to the Director and his staff to look at what is permissible and not. After 11 years, it's time to start looking at that, a lot of projects have been completed and there's other efforts that we do want to work on.

Ryan,[Chief Ryan Greenburg, DOH EMS], with your question before one of the things about a PSAP operations grant and EMD it's a 12-month performance period. So, by the time you get your contract move forward, select a vendor, go through all that, its hard to get it all done in 12 months. There are other funding opportunities though that people look at. But I believe its supported. One of our concerns, obviously, is Next Generation 911 and as consortium chairs, we're going to be chiming in on that a lot. We think this board should support the office I think to make it happen in New York State. It has to come from all but downtown. It has to come from the Senate, Assembly, and the Governor's office to support the commissioner here and get that done. It's been a long time coming. I've been in my role for 12 years, NextGen has been 3 to 5 years out for 12 years. So, I think the folks here are doing a great job with moving things forward, but we really need to push from this group and others and different associations across the state to move that forward. I know it's a hot topic for the 911 Coordinators as well, and I know they've been talking about it for the last few days.

In reference to what Brett was talking about with the location base routing, I think universally the consortium chairs would support that and support the board making comments to the FCC. I know I really don't plan on going back. Anything we can do to improve that, would be great. Same thing with 988 as well.

One of the other concerns as well, and maybe the Board may want to consider this in conversations or perhaps an urging to the Department of State, your code enforcement officials get continuing education every year that's mandated. There is a requirement for in-building coverage on all new building construction for radio communications, and a lot of places that's not being addressed. It gets very complex quickly. But we would urge that that be included in their yearly training. There's BDAs bi-directional amplifiers and public systems that improve in-building coverage that the way the law is written a local authority having jurisdiction, meaning, whoever runs that radio system has to sign off on the in-building coverages there. And for police, fire, and EMS with the size of some of these buildings, the construction technology today, the green technology today, LED lights and film on windows are all things that can impact

land mobile radios inside a building. In the International Building Code and in New York State Code it is addressed and it's just not being done consistently. So, we urge that be included through the Department of State in the building inspector's annual training so we can update that.

Again, we'll continue to be more organized and get somethings done and keep trying to push the director and get some things done to support the consortiums and the counties. That's all I have.

Mark Balistreri: Thank you Dana. Any questions for Dana? We also talked about expanding that group a little bit and offer invites to the State Agency working group have a representative from that group and also the 911 coordinators President or Vice President whoever could attend and Chris Tuttle at the federal level. I think that would round out a good core group of people that start communicating better. All of us, you know deal with communications all the time and sometimes the worse communicators are us. So, we want to try and I think clean up some of these committees and groups, get them more active and make sure we're all on the same page with things. It was incredible and Matt can attest to it as well, when we met individually with the state agencies, we were learning things and they were learning things, and that group has been together for a long time. So, I think we just need to reenergize some of those.

Anybody have any old business for the Board? Okay, I'll entertain a motion to accept old business?

Brian LaFlure: I'm make that motion Mr. Director.

Mark Balistreri: Brian LaFlure. Seconded Mr. Morris. All in favor?

All: Aye.

Mark Balistreri: Opposed? No delays on the phone. Okay, new business, does anybody have any new business before I go over what I have? Okay. It should only take about 45 minutes to an hour on what I have. (Everybody laughs). The only thing I have under new business, there is proposed bylaw changes that are in your packet as well. We looked at some of the committees and as I said, some of the topics that the committees had have long since expired. They haven't met, there was no need for them to meet, so there's some suggested bylaw changes there. I would like to add a bylaws committee to take a look at the bylaws and clean things up as we've already indicated, there is a bylaw that needs a little bit more language in there to meet the Open Meetings Law, clarifications. And I also wanted to look at formally putting in a state agency working group in the bylaws. Because that's going to be an active committee for a long time I'm sure. So, take a look at those changes. For those on the phone, we will e-mail you the document so everybody can view it. According to the bylaws we need to view it, look at it and discuss it next meeting and vote on it next meeting. That's how the process works according to the bylaws. That's all I have for new business. Is there any other new business? Entertain a motion for new business.

*State Interoperable &
Emergency Communication (SIEC)
Board Meeting
February 1, 2023*

Page 21 of 21

Male: _____ makes the motion.

Mark Balistreri: Okay and Bob Terry seconds. All those in favor?

All: Aye.

Mark Balistreri: Opposed? Carried. The other thing on your agenda which tell you the meeting dates for the year, we'll have that on the agenda in case you ever need to look back if you don't have them on your calendars. In closing, I just want to thank everybody for your time on this Board, I'm hoping that we can be more active, have some really good discussions, try and bring some new fresh topics here and we're going to try and reorganize and cleanup things a little bit. For those that don't know, Joann from our office is retired, unfortunately, it's a huge loss for us. Joann had a lot of things she did for ~~us~~ us, and she was always someone we could go to and get the answers to everything that had to do with OIEC. So, she will be sorely missed. So, when you see her out and about, she's retired. Anything else before we go to the order?

Lieutenant Morris Is anyone replacing Joann?

Mark Balistreri: Right now, most of the functions have been split out in the office for now, Kathy's got most of them, between Kathy and Phil.

Lieutenant Morris By split out we mean Kathy.

Mark Balistreri: Right. Any other questions or things. Again, thank you for the huge audience to all our guests in the 911 communities. Take a look at those changes. We can read through them if you want but I don't think we need to, everybody can read, so. Read through them, if you have any questions let us know and I'll entertain a motion for adjournment. Motion by Brian LaFlure, seconded by Ryan. All those in favor?

All: Aye.

Mark Balistreri: Opposed? Thank you everybody, have a good day.